DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 208 454 EA 013 795

AUTHOR Bennett, Christine; Harris, J. John, III
TITLE A Study of the Causes of Disproportionality in Suspensions and Expulsions of Male and Black Students. Part One: Characteristics of Disruptive and Non-Disruptive Students.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 14 Apr 81
GRANT OEG-79-5210
NOTE 54p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Los Angeles, CA, April 13-17, 1981). For a related document, see EA 013 796.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Expulsion; High Schools; Locus of Control; Power Structure; *Racial Discrimination; Racial Relations; School Attitudes; *Sex Discrimination; *Student Attitudes; *Suspension; Tables (Data)

ABSTRACT

A study of why disproportionate numbers of male and black high school students are suspended or expelled examines student and school characteristics and teacher attitudes. This document reports results on student characteristics. In eleven high schools in two large, urban, midwestern school districts, researchers used interviews, student records, questionnaire surveys, and state education department statistics to gather data on students' race, sex, achievement levels, family characteristics, and disciplinary histories as well as on their attitudes concerning control over self-destiny, dislike of school, fairness of punishments, board and administrator power, student and parent power, school climate, interracial relations and friendships, and white predominance. The results showed that, while males and blacks are disciplined more, the imbalance varied among schools in the same district. Analysis further indicated that highly disruptive students were less fatalistic, disliked school less, and felt punishments were fairer than did students who were mild disrupters or non-disrupters. However, serious disrupters also perceived boards, administrators, students, parents, and themselves as lacking power in the schools. The authors suggest that school programs to help student disrupters use decision-making strategies to build disrupters' feelings that they do have some control in school. (RW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED208454

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

A Study of the Causes of Disproportionality in Suspensions and Expulsions of Male and Black Students*

Part One: Characteristics of Disruptive and Non-Disruptive Students

Christine Bennett
and
J. John Harris, III

Indiana University at Bloomington

Presented at the Annual Meeting
of the American Educational
Research Association in
Los Angeles on
April 14, 1981

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. Bennett
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Based on research conducted for The Project for the Equitable Administration of Student Discipline, Co-Directed by Christine Bennett and J. John Harris, III, October 1971 - January 1981.

*USOEG #79-5210

The fact that disproportionate numbers of males and Blacks are being suspended and expelled from our schools has been well established (eg. Bickel, 1980; Moody, 1980). However, the reasons have not.

Are the causes of discipline problems rooted in the socio-emotional characteristics of disruptive students (eg. unstable home life)? In the character of certain schools? In teacher and administrator attitudes and beliefs? In some combination of these? Do the low disproportionality schools tolerate more "deviance" among Blacks and males? Do the formal and informal rules and how they are enforced differ among schools? Do students simply cause more trouble in some schools than in others?

One way of separating the student and institutional variables that may influence school discipline problems is to identify some characteristics of student "disrupters," as distinguished from student "non-disrupters." Another is to study the characteristics of "high" and "low" disproportionality schools and to identify factors which might explain the differences in school discipline disproportionately among Blacks and males.

This research project has studied both student characteristics and school characteristics. Our aim was to identify explanations of disproportionality among Black and male student "disrupters," and to identify promising school practices and conditions which help mediate the problem. Too voluminous to be presented in a single paper, the findings are reported in three papers which focus on student characteristics (Bennett and Harris, 1981), school characteristics (Bennett, 1981) and teacher and administrator attitudes and beliefs (Heid, 1981).

Our research was conducted in two large urban school corporations located in the midwest. Both corporations had previously been ranked among the country's one hundred most problematic school corporations concerning minorities and school discipline (HEW, 1976). Both corporations were concerned about the problem and agreed to participate in a study that would lead to programs designed to counter the problem of disproportionality in school discipline.

Each school corporation was treated as a totally separate research site, and all data were analyzed separately. However, the methodology and data collection techniques were nearly identical, and thus it was possible to examine the degree to which findings from the two separate school corporations would corroborate each other.

Our findings in the two different sites are, in fact, highly similar. The characteristics of "serious disrupters", as well as teacher attitudes and beliefs, are virtually identical. And, while some differences were discovered between the highest race disproportionality school in each site, the lowest race disproportionality schools were alike on most of the variables studied.

I. Methodology and Data Source

A. Overview

The study was conducted with the full cooperation of the central administration and building principals in both school corporations. Two Project Facilitators, one based in each school corporation, joined the project staff. These individuals proved to be invaluable liaisons, and were able to gain the parental permissions which allowed the

project staff to study student records in accordance with privacy regulations. They also provide access to statistics on school enrollments, student withdrawals, and student suspensions and expulsions. Data collection came from a variety of sources which include: taped interviews of students, parents, administrators, and teachers; student cumulative folders; school "discipline files;" paper-pencil questionnaires completed by students, teachers and administrators; and State Department statistics on enrollments, withdrawals, suspensions and expulsions, all broken down by school, sex and race.

The total number of high schools possible, five from one site and six from the other, participated in the study. All "serious disrupters," i.e. students who had been suspended three or more times and/or expelled from school, in each school corporation were identified (N = 322 and 362). Random samples of 100 and 110 students stratified by school, race, sex and grade level was selected from the population of "serious disrupters" in each district. Other random samples of 100 and 110 non-disrupters, again stratified by school, race and sex, were selected from the ninth, tenth and eleventh graders enrolled in each school. The family of each selected student was personally contacted for written permission to participate in the study. When permission was not obtained, another student was randomly selected.

A team of experienced interviewers was trained to conduct the interview using a common format. Interviewers and interviewees were

matched by race. Pairs of interviewers visited each home to conduct the parent and student interviews simultaneously and in separate rooms. The students also completed a paper-pencil questionnaire (ppq). A total of 210 student interviews and 210 parent interviews were completed; the interviews were taped, and later coded, and ranged from 30-60 minutes in length.

The remaining population of serious disrupters not interviewed was also studied. The following information was identified for all disrupters (N = 684) and recorded on Form A's whether or not they were interviewed: race, sex, GPA, grounds for suspension or expulsion, 8th grade reading and math achievement test scores, family structure and parent(s) occupation.

The student paper-pencil questionnaire (ppq) was also administered to a sample of 10-25% of the student population in each of the eleven high schools. Interviewees, the selected student "disrupters" and "non-disrupters," were not included in this sample.

Ten teachers and the top 3-4 administrators in each school were also interviewed. These administrators completed a pencil paper questionnaire as well. Finally, a randomly selected 20% of the teachers and students at each school (excluding those interviewed) also were asked to complete a paper pencil questionnaire.

Four interview formats were developed for this study by the project staff: an administrator, teacher, parent and student format. Although the formats differed, a common core of questions on student discipline used in previous research was included in each format, as was a common core on school desegregation. Three pencil paper questionnaire formats (for students, teachers and administrators) were also developed; most of the items had been used in previous research on school discipline and/or school desegregation (Bickel, 1979; Forehand and Ragosta, 1976; and Bennett, 1980).

Forms A and B were developed by the project staff to record personal history data on disruptive and non-disruptive students respectively. The forms were completed by members of the project staff who consulted student records (ie. cumulative folders and discipline files).

B. The Student Samples

1. Characteristics of Serious Disrupters in Site A: Interview Sample

Based on individual school discipline records, a total of 322 high school students were identified as having been suspended three

or more times and/or expelled from school during the 1979-80 school year. The personal records of each of these students were consulted and background information was gathered and recorded on Form A's. By far the most frequent grounds for charges brought against Black students were discretionary. Discretionary grounds include the following:

a. "Use of conduct which interferes with school purposes (violence, force, noise, coercion, etc.)." (Note: fighting, stealing, damaging property, and weapon possession were not included here.)

j. "Failure to comply with directions of teachers when judged to be interferring with school purposes," and

l. "Violation, or repeated violation, of school rules validly adopted." (Note: Fighting, stealing, damaging property, and weapon possession were <u>not</u> included here.)

The most frequent grounds for charges brought against White students were truancy, followed by discretionary and drugs. Stealing, fighting, and weapon possession were relatively infrequent grounds against any student, but all three were brought against Blacks more often than against Whites. On the other hand, drug charges and truancy were much more common charges for White than Black students (Bennett and Harris, 1981a).

The findings on curriculum must be viewed with caution since this information was not available in 75 of the 322 cases. However, most Black student disrupters were enrolled in a general or vocational curriculum. This pattern was also true for White student disrupters, although college prep and business programs also emerged. Only one student was enrolled in special education.

Overall, more than half of these students live with two parents, when the remarried parents are included. However, among Black student "disrupters" more than half live in homes with a divorced single parent.

Unfortunately, reading and math achievement test scores were not recorded for a large number of student "disrupters." Thus, the figures are only suggestive. Considering those students for whom the scores were available it is clear that a good number had scored below grade level on eighth grade achievement tests. This was markedly true among Black students, as compared with Whites, over half of whom scored at or above grade level on reading.

2. Characteristics of the Student Population Cross-Sections (PPQ Sample) in Sites A and B: PPQ Sample

In site A, the ppq sample (N = 727) may be characterized as college prep students who evaluate themselves as average to above average students with the ability to succeed in college. The vaste majority of their parents have not attended a PTA meeting, most know a school adult who will help when they are in trouble, and the vaste majority have never been in a fight at school. Approximately two-thirds live with both parents, take a newspaper at home, and have mothers with a high school or college education. The sample is

predominantly White, with only 68 of the 727 students being Black. Only 85 of the sample reported one or more suspensions.

The student ppq sample (N = 1266) in Site B appears to be a truer representation of the total student population than in Site A. The Site B sample is characterized by students who are dispersed across all of the curriculum areas, and who see themselves as average to somewhat above average students with "probable" ability to succeed in college.

The sample is a good cross-section of the school community in terms of sex and race. Approximately 10% report having been in a fight "this year," and 20% have been suspended at least once. Thus, while the sample may not be totally random, neither is it "hand picked." As is true in Site A, most ppq students have parents who have not attended a PTA meeting, most have never been suspended or in a fight, and most receive a newspaper at home. School differences were noted within the student ppq samples on a number of selected student characteristics. Most of these differences were "school" based, rather than related to family conditions, and are discussed elsewhere (Bennett, 1981).

The focus of this paper is the characteristics of "serious disrupters," as compared with non-disrupters. Reported elsewhere in our study of characteristics which distinguish high and low disproportionality schools (Bennett, 1981). However, findings related to school differences and overall patterns of disproportionality will be highlighted here to provide a context for the discussion of the differences between student disrupters and nondisrupters.

II. Findings

A. Overview of Findings on Disproportionality in School Discipline

The GINI Index of Dissimilarity was used to examine the degree to which disproportionate numbers of male and/or Black students comprised the serious disrupter population. As used in this study's context, the GINI Index identifies the proportion of Black and male disrupters which would need to be redistributed among White and female disrupters in order to eliminate disproportionality. Tables 1a and 2a display the GINI indices for each of the five high schools in Site A, and Tables 1b and 2b display the indices for each school in Site B.

(Insert Tables 1a and 1b)

(Insert Tables 2a and 2b)

These findings show a disproportionately high number of Black and male "serious disrupters" in each of the eleven high schools. However, there are striking differences in the degree of disproportionality within the different schools, particularly with regard to Black students.

For Site A, Table 1a identifies School Five as having the highest level of race disproportionality and School Two the lowest. The number of Black and White "disrupters" in School Five is almost equal, even though Black students comprise only 1/12 of the total student population. The GINI Index for School Five is .415, meaning that in order to eliminate racial disproportionality, nearly half of the Black serious disrupters would need to be White. In School Two the GINI Index is much lower (.075) indicating that approximately 7½ percent

of the Black disrupters would need to be White in order to eliminate racial disproportionality. School One has the second lowest GINI Index (.112), and Schools Three and Four are fairly similar with GINI indices of .162 and .144 respectively.

Table 2a shows that males are also over-represented among the "serious disrupters". In no other school is the level of disproportionality among males as high as it is among Blacks in School Five. However, except for School Five the disproportionality level for males in all schools is higher than for Blacks, particularly in Schools Three and Four. School Two again emerges as the school with the lowest level of disproportionality.

The findings for Site B also show a disproportionately high number of Black and male "serious disrupters" in each of the six high schools. However, there are again clear differences in the degree of disproportionality within the different schools. Table 1b identifies Schools One, Two and Three as having relatively high levels of race disproportionality, with School Three being highest. School Five reflects a strikingly low level of disproportionality. (However, for the school corporation as a whole, this school also has the highest number of "serious disrupters" for both Black and White students. There are over three times as many Black disrupters and seven times as many White disrupters in School Five as compared with School Three which is most comparable in size.) The number of Black and White "disrupters" in Schools One and Three is almost equal, even though Black students comprise only about one-fifth and one-sixth of the respective total school populations. The GINI Index for School

Three is .298, meaning that in order to eliminate racial disproportionality nearly a third of the Black serious disrupters would need to be White. In Schools One and Two, approximately one quarter of the Black "serious disrupters" would need to be White in order to eliminate racial disproportionality. In School Five the GINI Index is much lower (.036) indicating that approximately 3½ percent of the Black disrupters would need to be White in order to eliminate racial disproportionality. School Six has the second lowest GINI Index (.110) and School Four the third lowest (.193).

Table 2b shows that males are also over-represented among the "serious disrupters" in Site B. However, the degree of sex disproportionality is lower than that of race disproportionality in each school except Schools Five and Six. School One shows the lowest level of sex disproportionality with a GINI Index of .025, and School Three is again the highest with an Index of .271.

As schools work harder to retain students who might otherwise drop out at age sixteen, they may also be increasing their number of "discipline problems." Ironically, those schools which do the least for problem students may experience fewer discipline problems because potential disrupters drop out. Thus one possible explanation for the striking school differences in race and sex disproportionality among "disrupters" is that levels of student withdrawals may be highest in schools where disproportionality among disrupters is lowest. Possibly, in some schools more students drop out prior to being suspended or expelled than in other schools. However, our findings

did not support this conclusion. Patterns of school and student race/sex differences in student withdrawal were mirror images of the student "disruptions" (Bennett, 1981).

B. Comparisons Between Never Suspended Students, Once+ Suspended Students, Non-Disrupters and "Serious Disrupters" on Selected PPQ Variables

1. The Self Indices: Fatalism, Dislike School, and Fair Punishment

All of the ppq items with a personal or self focus were factor analyzed. Three factors emerged and were used as separate indicators.

a. Fatalism Index

Ten items were found to comprise the Fatalism Index. These same items have been used extensively in other research to measure locus of control or the degree to which an individual believes s/he has control over his or her destiny, and are the following:

When bad things are going to happen, they just are going to happen no matter what you try to do to stop them.

1. agree
2. disagree

On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.

1. agree
2. disagree

Good luck is just as important for success as hard work is.

1. agree
2. disagree

I feel I do not have much to be proud of.

1. agree
2. disagree

Some kids are just naturally lucky.

1. agree
2. disagree

I feel like I don't really belong in this school.

1. agree
2. disagree

When I make plans, I am almost sure I can make them work.

1. agree
2. disagree

Most people are better off than I am.

1. agree
2. disagree

Most of the time it doesn't pay to try hard because things never turn out right anyway.

1. agree
2. disagree

Everything considered are you happy, pretty happy, or not too happy these days?

1. very happy
2. pretty happy
3. not too happy

These items were scored such that a high score indicated a high degree of "fatalism," or a feeling of lack of personal control over the environment.

In both sites, a striking difference emerged when never suspended students were compared with students suspended one or more times (Insert Tables 3a and 3b). Students who had been suspended only one or two times revealed higher levels of fatalism than the students who had never been suspended. However, there also emerged a trend showing lowest levels of fatalism among the students who had been

suspended most frequently. This trend was supported by the study of "serious disruptors" and non-disrupters. As shown in Tables 4a and 4b, the interviewed "serious disrupters" scored significantly lower on Fatalism than did their interviewed non-disruptive classmates.

These findings suggest that the schools "serious disrupters" have a lower sense of fatalism, and thus a higher sense of personal efficacy than do "non-disrupters."

b. Dislike School Index

The five following ppq items emerged as one factor which was labeled as a DISLIKE SCHOOL Index.

81. Do you like the principal of this school?

1. yes
2. no
3. I don't know

82. Do you think you will go to college?

1. yes
2. no

83. In the morning, are you usually glad to go to school?

1. yes
2. no

86. Do you hate school?

1. yes
2. no

87. Do you usually hate school?

1. yes
2. no

These items were scored such that a high score meant dislike of principal, no college plans, not glad to attend school, hate and usually hate school.

Significant differences were discovered on the DISLIKE SCHOOL Index between never and once+ suspended students in both sites. As shown in Tables 5a and 5b the never-suspended students scored higher on the Dislike School Index than once+ suspended students. Comparisons between the interviewed serious disrupters and non-disrupters further substantiate these findings; the "serious" disrupters score lower on dislike school (see Tables 6a and 6b). These findings suggest that the school "trouble-makers" studied are more positive about school than their never-suspended classmates.

c. Unfair Punishment Index

The following two items formed a separate factor and were labeled the Unfair Punishment Index:

84. When you get punished at school, does it usually seem it's for no good reason at all?

1. yes
2. no
3. I have never been punished

85. Compared to other students you know, do you feel you get punished fairly?

1. yes
2. no
3. I haven't been punished at school

The higher the score the higher the feeling that punishment occurs for no good reason and is unfair in comparison with classmates.

When never suspended students are compared with once+ suspended students the differences are significant. And as in the case of Dislike School, the never suspended student's score higher than the once+ suspended. In both Sites A and B, more never suspended students tend to believe school punishment is unfair than

do their classmates who have been suspended one or more times. (See Tables 7a and 7b) Comparisons of the non and serious disrupters interviewed again corroborates findings based on the ppq sample. The disrupters scored lower on Unfair Punishment (See Tables 8a and 8b).

It appears from the three "Self Indices" that the school's worst trouble makers have stronger feelings of personal efficacy than do their high achieving, scholastically successful classmates. Furthermore, they score lower on Hate School and higher on Fair Punishment than their never suspended classmates.

A conclusion that the school's most successful students have a low sense of personal efficacy, hate school, and see the school as treating students unfairly does not seem warranted. While the achievers and conformers may not be as positive about school as many educators assume, they obviously have decided to achieve and conform and feel enough efficacy to do so. What is most important here, is the finding that many of the schools' worst troublemakers feel positive about school and value education. Furthermore, they appear to have a strong sense of personal efficacy.

7. The Power Indices: Institutional Power and Grassroots Power

Eight ppq items which dealt with how much influence the student felt different groups of persons have in his or her school were factor analyzed (Items 91-99 on the ppq). Two factors emerged: Institutional Power and Grassroots Power. Institutional Power represents the influence of the school board, superintendent and principal. Grassroots

Power represents the influence of the self, students and parents. No factor emerged to represent teachers and assistant principals, whose influence seemed to rest somewhere between the two other groups.

Highly significant differences on Institutional Power emerged between never and once+ suspended students in both Sites. Never suspended students tend to perceive the School Board, Superintendent and Principal as having more school influence than do students who have been suspended one or more times. (See Tables 9a and 9b)

Comparisons between never and once+ suspended students on Grassroots Power show highly significant differences in Site A.* Students who have never been suspended perceive much more school influence for themselves, other students and parents than do students who have been suspended. Thus, their perceptions of strong institutional power is not at the expense of their own sense of efficacy. Once+ suspended students perceive low levels of both institutional and personal influence in their school.

Findings on the two Power Indices among the interview samples from both Sites strongly corrobate the larger sample findings. As shown in Tables 10a and 11a and 10b and 11b, non-disrupters score higher than "serious disrupters" on Institutional Power and on Grassroots Power. This supports the data from the larger ppq sample where never

---

*There is a non-significant trend in Site B to support this finding.

suspended students scored higher than once+ suspended students on both power indices. Therefore, although "serious disrupters" have a strong sense of personal efficacy (ie. lowest on Fatalism), concerning the school environment they perceive very little influence from themselves, other students, and parents. They also perceive very little influence coming from the superintendent, school board, and their principal.

3. Positive School Climate Index

Questions 12-25 on the ppq comprised a single factor which was labeled the School Climate Index (Bickel, 1980). These items were scored so that the higher an index score is, the more positive are feelings about school climate. Significant differences were found between the never and once+ suspended students in each Site.

Tables 13a and 13b show that never suspended students were less positive about their school than were the once+ suspended students.

The interview samples in Site A did not yield significant differences between "disrupters" and non-disrupters" on Positive School Climate. However, as shown in Table 14b, "serious disrupters" in Site B scored significantly higher on Positive School Climate than did non-disrupters. Overall, it appears that the once+ suspended students and the "serious disrupters" in this study tend to feel more positive about their school climate than do never-suspended students.

4. The School Desegregation Indices: Interracial Environment, Interracial Friendship and White Predominance

Questions 26-63 on the ppq dealt with school desegregation. These items were factor analyzed and yielded three factors: Interracial Environment, Interracial Friendship, and White Predominance.

a. Interracial Environment

The following items comprised the Interracial Environment Index:

32. If you could choose the kind of school you would go to, would you pick one with

    1. all white students
    2. all black students
    3. a mixture of different kinds of students

33. Do you think your friends would think badly of you if you went someplace after school with a student of a different race?

    1. yes
    2. no

57. How uncomfortable do you feel around students of a different race?

    1. generally very uncomfortable
    2. generally somewhat uncomfortable
    3. occasionally somewhat uncomfortable
    4. not at all uncomfortable

58. Are the student government officers in this school all of the same racial group, or are they different groups?

    1. all of the same racial group
    2. different groups

59. Are the cheerleaders in your school all of the same racial group, or are they from different groups?

    1. all of the same racial group
    2. different groups

60. How often do you have class discussions about race relations?

    1. about once a week or more often
    2. about once a month
    3. every few months
    4. no such discussions so far

61. In general, do you think that white people are smarter than black people, that black people are smarter than white people, or do you think that a person's color doesn't have anything to do with how smart he is?

    1. white people are smarter
    2. black people are smarter
    3. color doesn't have anything to do with smartness

62. The way things are going between blacks and whites in this school, do you think things will be better or worse next year?

    1. better
    2. same
    3. worse

These items were scored so that more points were given for choices indicating support for interracial interaction. The index was believed to measure the student's and the school's support for an interracial school environment.

Significant school differences as well as race/sex differences were discovered on the Interracial Environment Index. These are discussed elsewhere (Bennett, 1981). However, no significant differences were noted between either never and once+ suspended students or between non-disrupters and serious disrupters.

b. Interracial Friendship

The Index of Interracial Friendship differs from the Interracial Environment Index in that it measures interracial relations of a more personal nature such as phone conversations, seeking help on homework, and the desire for friends of a different race. The factor which was converted into this index consists of four items:

29. Have you ever called a student of a different race on the phone?

    1. yes
    2. no

30. This school year, have you helped a student from another race with school work?

    1. yes
    2. no

31. This school year, have you asked a student from another race to help you with your homework?

    1. yes
    2. no

34. Would you like to have more friends who are of a different race?

    1. yes
    2. no

These were scored so that a high score indicated interracial mix.

The Interracial Friendship Index produced significant differences between the never and once+ suspended students. Tables 15a and 15b reveal the lowest score for never suspended students, and higher scores among students suspended one, two, three and six+ times in Site A and among students suspended one, two, three, four and six+ times in Site B. Thus it appears that there is more interracial mixing on a personal level among students who have been suspended one or more times than among students who have never been suspended.

c. The White Predominance Index

The White Predominance Index, believed to top orientations of racism, yield signficant sex/race group differences and sighificant school differences. These differences as well as the items are discussed elsewhere (Bennett, 1981). No differences were noted on this measure between never and once+ suspended students. However significant differences between non-disrupters and serious disrupters

were discovered in Site B (see Table 16b), where disrupters scored significantly lower on the White Predominance Index.

Overall, findings on the school desegregation measures used in this study show more positive interracial attitudes and behaviors among serious disrupters than among non-disrupters.

III. Conclusions

What can we conclude from this study about the causes of disproportionality among Black and male "serious disrupters?" Causation is difficult to prove on any cross-sectional study, but our findings do warrant a number of conclusions. The answer is somewhat different for male student disrupters in general, and the Black student disrupters.

First, while there is always an interaction between the home and school environments, we cannot place the "blame" at the students' doorstep. The serious disrupters in both Site A and Site B come to school with a strikingly high sense of personal efficacy. In addition to a strong sense of personal efficacy, the serious disrupters come with positive feelings about school, and when they do get into trouble they tend to feel their punishment has been reasonable and fair. What they lack is a sense of personal efficacy concerning the school. In fact, among the disruptive students no person or group (i.e. superintendent, principal or school board) emerges as having much influence at school. This overall sense of power vaccuum in the school is significant. The contrast in feelings of personal and school efficacy may help explain the disproportionate numbers of males who are suspended and expelled from schools.

Although recent social events are no doubt increasing females sense of personal efficacy, there is a good deal of evidence which shows that at least until recently, females in our society tend to have a lower sense of efficacy than males. Thus, it is possible that males have higher self expectations for school success and activity and therefore feel greater frustration with failure in school. Conflicting levels of personal and schol efficacy may result in more "disturbance," or "acting out."

Since the sample of female disrupters is so small, comparisons of the levels of personal efficacy between the male and female disrupters studied are not possible. But judging from previous research (e.g. Bennett, 1972), females' levels of personal efficacy are probably lower than their male classmates. Thus they may have lower expectations for school success and feel less frustrated by school failure.

Our findings on the characteristics of disrupters and non-disrupters apply to both Black and White students. In fact, with the exception of White males' scores on White Predominance, Interracial Friendship and Interracial Environment, no significant differences emerge by race on any of the ppq indices, although there was a trend showing Black males and Black females to be highest on unfair punishment. Thus student status as a disrupter or non-disrupter is a more salient factor in this study than is the variable of race.

Our findings suggest that school programs designed to help "disruptive students" should build feelings of school efficacy. Programs should use decision making strategies and other activities designed to "give kids a stake in the school." There is evidence to

support the position that schools can increase student's feelings of efficacy in relatively brief periods of time (e.g. Ehman, 1970; Glasser, 1976; Bennett, 1972). Other research (e.g. Forehand and Rogosta, 1976) indicates that the most effective approach would be one which carries strong institutional support in cooperation with student and parent involvement and real influence. Such programs may be especially important for males, and should begin early in the elementary school.

The exact causes of disproportionality among Black students are difficult to establish. However, our broader findings show that these causes are related to an overall orientation of White predominance which includes institutional and individual racism. Sources of racism are difficult to pinpoint because they originate in a social context beyond the school, but this does not relieve the school from taking action to mediate racism.

Black parent and Black student perceptions that some teachers and administrators are racist are borne out by the results of the anonymous Tppq (Bennett and Harris, 1981). Many of the teachers would not live in a desegregated neighborhood, did not favor mandatory school desegregation, felt the civil rights movement had done more harm than good, and felt that the problems of prejudice were exaggerated. One third believed that Blacks and Whites should not be allowed to intermarry. Furthermore, the majority of the teachers perceived their White students to be superior intellectually and socially, and in other characteristics related to school achievement. Given what we

know about the power of teacher expectations, the picture is grim for many Black students. Added to the racist orientation of many teachers, is the "White predominance" orientation among students who completed the ppq, particularly White male students.

Reported in Part II of this paper, our findings concerning the descriptions of "high" and "low" disproportionality schools (Bennett, 1981), support acertains made by other researchers (e.g. Bickel, 1980, Moody, 1978) that the schools themselves are in some measure responsible for race disproportionality in student discipline. Considering that a majority of the Black students studied live in the same neighborhood and that the males and females come from comparable neighborhoods, we must wonder why higher proportions of Black and male students are suspended and expelled in some schools than in others. When we find, as was the case in this study, that in the schools showing the highest levels of race and sex disproportionality students score highest on Dislike School, highest on Unfair Punishment, lowest on Administrator Support of School Desegregation, lowest on Interracial Environment, and highest on White Predominance, we realize that there are school conditions which make school discipline problems worse, or better.

Previous studies have shown that an open and strong commitment to "good race relations" and "academic achievement" on the part of administrators is needed for an effectively integrated school and equitable student discipline (Forehand and Rogosta). A large portion of the teachers in this study reported that they did not know how

their superintendent felt about school desegregation, and a majority perceived that the White, but not Black, teachers in their school were opposed to school desegregation (Heid, 1981). Furthermore, in spite of extensive inservice efforts in both school corporations, very few teachers reported any inservice related to teaching in desegregated settings (i.e. less than 10%).

The fact that each school corporation was a willing participant in this study strongly attests to a genuine concern and commitment to equitable student discipline and effective school integration. This commitment must be translated into strategies which impact certain teachers' attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors if equitable school discipline is to be achieved. These strategies should involve teachers who already share a commitment to equitable school discipline and effective integration.

Our conclusions do place the burden of action on the school. No doubt other factors not part of the school and not studied on this research help explain why disproportionate numbers of males and Blacks are disciplined in Sites A and B. What should make us feel optimistic about this research, as well as the conclusions of other research (e.g. Weinberg) is that schools <u>can</u> make a difference in spite of broader social factors.

Table 1a

Race Disproportionality of "Serious Disrupter" in Site B by School GINI Index of Dissimilarity

		Disrupter		Non-Disrupter	Total
School 1	B	14	.112	293	307
	W	29		1,078	1,107
School 2	B	12	.075	129	141
	W	72		1,780	1,852
School 3	B	21	.162	210	231
	W	55		1,623	1,678
School 4	B	12	.144	153	165
	W	38		1,434	1,472
School 5	B	34	.415	132	166
	W	35		1,563	1,598

Table 2a

Race Disproportionality of "Serious Disrupter" in Site B by School GINI Index of Dissimilarity

		Disrupter		Non-Disrupter	Total
School 1	Males	29	.173	688	717
	Females	14		683	697
School 2	Males	50	.086	972	1,022
	Females	34		937	971
School 3	Males	59	.290	892	951
	Females	17		941	958
School 4	Males	39	.265	817	856
	Females	11		770	781
School 5	Males	51	.220	880	931
	Females	18		815	833

Table 1b

Race Disproportionality of "Serious Disrupter" in Site B
by School GINI Index of Dissimilarity

School	GINI Index		Disrupter	Non Disrupter	Tot
1	.242	B	9	241	250
		W	11	918	929
2	.237	B	6	123	129
		W	11	938	949
3	.298	B	13	316	329
		W	16	1780	1796
4	.193	B	17	175	192
		W	38	1326	1364
5	.036	B	46	320	366
		W	113	942	1055
6	.110	B	25	234	259
		W	57	965	1022

Table 2b

Sex Disproportionality of "Serious Disrupters" in Site B
by School GINI Index of Dissimilarity

School	GINI Index		Disrupter	Non Disrupter	Tot
1	.242	M	11	609	620
		F	9	550	559
2	.115	M	7	559	566
		F	10	502	512
3	.271	M	23	1094	1117
		F	6	1002	1008
4	.172	M	38	774	812
		F	17	717	734
5	.134	M	100	624	724
		F	59	638	697
6	.225	M	58	650	658
		F	22	601	623

Table 3a

Fatalism Index Broken Down by
Never or Once+ Suspended

	Mean	Std Dev	N
Suspension			
Never	6.8710	1.8547	(566)
Once	7.4211	5.0778	(57)
Twice	7.9231	8.4800	(13)
Thrice	6.7500	.9574	(4)
Four Times	7.0000	1.0000	(3)
Six Times or More	5.6667	.5774	(3)
Total	6.9583	2.6337	(648)

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ANOVA TABLE * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square
Between Groups	232.0557	(7)	33.1508
Within Groups	4255.8193	(640)	6.6497
Total	4487.8750	(647)	

F = 4.9853 SIG. = .0000

* *

Table 3b

Analysis of Variance
Fatalism Index by Never or Once+ Suspended

Times Suspended	Mean	Std Dev	N
1. Never	6.8444	1.4703	(1054)
2. Once	6.9421	2.6561	(121)
3. Twice	8.3810	6.2311	(42)
4. Thrice	7.2353	3.4375	(17)
5. Four Times	6.0000	1.4142	(7)
6. Five Times	6.1667	1.1690	(6)
7. Six Times or More	7.3125	2.6260	(19)
Total	6.9068	2.0167	(1266)

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ANOVA TABLE * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom
Between Groups	110.0235	(7)
Within Groups	5034.9781	(1258)
Total	5145.0016	(1265)

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Table 4a

Scores on FATALISM INDEX by Disruptive and Non-Disruptive Student: Analysis of Variance

	Mean	SD	N
Serious Disrupter	5.9231	2.4962	39
Non-Disrupter	6.9348	1.3565	46
Total	6.4706		85

Anova Table

	Sum of Squares	DF
Between Groups	21.6029	1
Within Groups	319.5736	83

F = 5.6107 SIG. = .0202

Table 4b

Mean Scores on FATALISM INDEX by Disruptive and Non-Disruptive Students in Site B: Analysis of Variance

	Mean	SD	N
Serious Disrupter	6.1455	1.0438	55
Non-Disrupter	7.0500	1.0156	60
Total	6.6174	1.1206	115

Anova Table

	Sum of Squares	DF
Between Groups	23.4789	1
Within Groups	119.6864	113

F = 22.1672 SIG. = .0000

Table 5a

Dislike School Index Broken Down
by Never or Once+ Suspended

	Mean	Std Dev	N
Suspension			
Never	6.8142	1.4226	(565)
Once	6.7193	2.5618	(57)
Twice	6.5333	1.6847	(15)
Thrice	5.7500	.9574	(4)
Four Times	7.6667	.5774	(3)
Six Times or More	5.6667	1.5275	(3)
Total	6.8336	1.9341	(648)

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ANOVA TABLE * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square
Between Groups	867.2156	(7)	123.8879
Within Groups	1556.8122	(641)	2.4287
Total	2424.0277	(648)	

F = 51.0095 SIG. = 0

* *

Table 5b

Analysis of Variance
Dislike School Index by Never and Once+ Suspended

Times Suspended	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
1. Never	7.3692	1.3616	(1051)
2. Once	6.9250	1.3483	(120)
3. Twice	7.3902	4.0428	(41)
4. Thrice	6.3529	1.4552	(17)
5. Four Times	9.2857	8.4205	(7)
6. Five Times	6.8333	1.1690	(6)
7. Six Times or More	5.7778	1.5168	(18)
Total	7.3009	1.6495	(1263)

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ANOVA TABLE * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom
Between Groups	109.5714	(7)
Within Groups	3324.0976	(1255)
Total	3433.6690	(1262)

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Table 6a

Scores on DISLIKE SCHOOL INDEX by Disrupter and Non-Disrupter: Analysis of Variance

	Mean	SD	N
Serious Disrupter	5.6842	2.2673	38
Non-Disrupter	7.1875	1.3630	48
Total	6.5233		86

Anova Table

	Sum of Squares	DF
Between Groups	47.9305	1
Within Groups	277.5230	84

F = 14.5075 SIG. = .0003

Table 7a

Unfair Punishment Index Broken Down
By Never and Once+ Suspended

	Mean	Std Dev	N
Suspension			
Never	4.6719	1.6005	(577)
Once	3.5593	1.0711	(59)
Twice	4.0625	2.3514	(16)
Thrice	3.2500	.5000	(4)
Four Times	2.6667	.5774	(3)
Six Times or More	6.0000	5.1962	(3)
Total	4.5641	1.7185	(663)

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ANOVA TABLE * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square
Between Groups	277.1447	(7)	39.5921
Within Groups	1677.8809	(655)	2.5617
Total	1955.0256	(662)	

F = 15.4557 SIG. = 0

* *

Table 7b

Unfair Punishment Index By Never and Once+ Suspended

Times Suspended	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
1. Never	4.7343	1.4848	(1057)
2. Once	3.5410	1.3432	(122)
3. Twice	4.2619	3.0288	(42)
4. Thrice	3.2353	2.1074	(17)
5. Four Times	5.1429	5.7570	(7)
6. Five Times	5.3333	2.8048	(6)
7. Six Times or More	3.4444	.7838	(18)
Total	4.5713	1.6525	(1269)

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ANOVA TABLE * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom
Between Groups	221.0713	(7)
Within Groups	3241.7246	(1261)
Total	3462.7959	(1268)

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Table 8a

Scores on UNFAIR PUNISHMENT INDEX by Serious Disrupter and Non-Disrupter: Analysis of Variance

	Mean	SD	N
Serious Disrupter	2.8974	1.3726	39
Non-Disrupter	4.6667	1.6927	48
Total	3.8736		87

Anova Table

	Sum of Squares	DF
Between Groups	67.3528	1
Within Groups	206.2564	85

F = 27.7566 SIG. = .0000

Table 9a

Institutional Power Index Broken Down
By Never and Once+ Suspended

	Mean	Std Dev	N
Suspension			
Never	9.3726	3.2545	(642)
Once	8.1356	3.7021	(59)
Twice	6.5625	1.8246	(16)
Thrice	10.2500	3.2016	(4)
Four Times	9.6667	4.1633	(3)
Six Times or More	6.6667	3.2146	(3)
Total			(727)

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ANOVA TABLE * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom
Between Groups	2,350.4216	(7)
Within Groups	8,304.5578	(726)

F = 29.0710 SIG. = 0

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Table 10a

Scores on the INSTITUTIONAL POWER INDEX by Disrupter and Non-Disrupter: Analysis of Variance

	Mean	SD	N
Serious Disrupter	6.7143	3.9834	42
Non-Disrupter	9.6875	3.1834	48
Total	8.3000		90

Anova Table

	Sum of Squares	DF
Between Groups	198.0161	1
Within Groups	1,126.8839	88

F = 15.4634 SIG. = .0002

Table 10b

Mean Scores on the INSTITUTIONAL POWER INDEX by Disrupter and Non-Disrupter in Site B: Analysis of Variance

	Mean	SD	N
Disrupter	7.1803	3.5614	61
Non-Disrupter	9.7742	3.2463	62
Total	8.4878	3.6336	123

Anova Table

	Sum of Squares	DF
Between Groups	206.8766	1
Within Groups	1403.8551	121
Total	1610.7317	122

F = 17.8309 SIG. = .0000

Table 11a

Grassroots Power Broken Down
By Never and Once+ Suspended

	Mean	Std Dev	N
Suspension			
Never	7.2080	3.0633	(642)
Once	6.6441	3.1773	(59)
Twice	6.8750	3.9812	(16)
Thrice	5.0000	1.6330	(4)
Four Times	9.0000	2.6458	(3)
Six Times or More	6.3333	2.0817	(3)
Total	6.7950	3.5033	(727)

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ANOVA TABLE * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom
Between Groups	1,504.0393	(7)
Within Groups	7,406.4229	(719)

F = 20.8584 SIG. = 0

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Table 12a

Scores on GRASSROOTS POWER by Disrupter and Non-Disrupter: Analysis of Variance

	Mean	SD	N
Disrupter	6.3571	3.6212	42
Non-Disrupter	7.9583	3.1955	48
Total	7.2111		90

Anova Table

	Sum of Squares	DF
Between Groups	57.4294	1
Within Groups	1,017.5595	88

F = 4.9666 SIG. = .0284

Table 12b

Mean Scores on GRASSROOTS POWER by Disrupter and Non-Disrupter in Site B: Analysis of Variance

	Mean	SD	N
Serious Disrupter	6.0984	3.2798	61
Non-Disrupter	7.5161	3.1557	62
Total	6.8130	3.2827	123

Anova Table

	Sum of Squares	DF
Between Groups	61.8055	1
Within Groups	1252.8937	121
Total	1314.6992	122

F = 5.9690 SIG. = .0160

Table 13a

Positive School Climate Index Broken Down
By Never and Once+ Suspended

	Mean	Std Dev	N
Suspension			
Never	37.4171	9.3263	(562)
Once	41.3929	9.6402	(56)
Twice	40.8750	8.9954	(16)
Thrice	44.7500	9.7767	(4)
Four Times	37.0000	3.6056	(3)
Six Times or More	57.3333	4.5092	(3)

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ANOVA TABLE * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom
Between Groups	2,613.8185	(7)
Within Groups	55,386.9195	(637)

F = 4.2945 SIG. = .0001

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Table 13b

Positive School Climate By Never and Once+ Suspended

Times Suspended	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
1. Never	34.9815	9.2920	1030
2. Once	38.8655	9.3482	119
3. Twice	41.0244	9.4432	41
4. Thrice	41.0625	9.2410	16
5. Four Times	44.7143	13.8770	7
6. Five Times	41.2500	6.0759	4
7. Six Times or More	46.8235	10.2117	17
Total	35.8744	9.5726	1234

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * ANOVA TABLE * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom
Between Groups	6104.4713	7
Within Groups	.106E+06	1226
Total	.112E+06	1233

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Table 14b

Scores on Positive School Climate Index by Disrupter and Non-Disrupter in Site B: Analysis of Variance

	Mean		N
Serious Disrupter	36.5738	13.5259	61
Non-Disrupter	31.6290	9.0431	62
Total	34.0813	11.7058	123

Anova Table

	Sum of Squares	DF
Between Groups	751.8012	1
Within Groups	15,965.3855	121

F = 5.6978 SIG. = .0185

Table 15a

Scores on INTERRACIAL FRIENDSHIP INDEX by
Never and Once+ Suspended:
Analysis of Variance

	Mean	SD	N
Never suspended	6.3794	2.1244	564
Suspended once	9.1525	4.3502	59
Suspended twice	9.3750	6.6420	16
Suspended thrice	6.7500	.9574	4
Suspended four times	6.0000	0	3
Suspended six+ times	8.0000	0	3
Total	6.5300		649

Anova Table

	Sum of Squares	DF
Between Groups	173.2374	7
Within Groups	4,302.9285	

F = 3.6982 SIG. = .0006

Table 15b

Scores on Interracial Friendship Index by Never and Once+ Suspended: Analysis of Variance

Times Suspended	Mean	Std. Dev.	N
1. Never	6.4202	2.2049	1043
2. Once	7.0492	3.5972	122
3. Twice	7.1905	3.5834	42
4. Thrice	6.7647	3.0929	17
5. Four times	12.7143	11.6578	7
6. Five times	6.1667	1.3292	6
7. Six times or more	6.8235	1.1851	17
Total	6.5494	2.6022	1254

Table 16b

Mean Scores on WHITE PREDOMINANCE INDEX by Disrupter and Non-Disrupter in Site B: Analysis of Variance

	Mean	SD	N
Disrupter	39.4364	4.9245	55
Non-Disrupter	42.0333	4.0879	60
Total	40.7913	4.6726	115

Anova Table

	Sum of Squares	DF
Between Groups	193.5307	1
Within Groups	2295.4606	113
Total	2488.9913	114

F = 9.5271 SIG. = .0025

References

Arnove, Robert F. with Stout, Toby. Alternative Schools for Disruptive Youth. ERIC 162 413, 1977.

Bennett, Christine. Part I of "A Study of the Causes of Disproportionality in Suspensions and Expulsions of Male and Black Students: Characteristics of Disruptive and Non-Disruptive Students." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association in Los Angeles, April 1981.

Bennett, Christine. "Political Education for Minority Groups." Chapter 9. New Views of Children and Politics. Richard G. Nieme (ed.) San Francisco: Jersey-Bass, 1974.

Bennett, Christine. "Student Initiated Interaction as an Indicator of Interracial Acceptance in Desegregated Schools." The Journal of Classroom Interaction, Summer, 1980.

Bennett, Christine and Harris, J. John, III. The Project for the Equitable Administration of Student Discipline." USOE Grant #79-5210, Final Report, 1981.

Bickel, Frank and Qualls, Robert. "The Impact of School Climate on Suspension Rates in the Jefferson County Public Schools." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association in Boston, April, 1981.

Department of Health, Education and Welfare. 1978 Elementary and Secondary Schools Civil Rights Survey. Office For Civil Rights, Reports on Ranked Districts For the Nation, Volume I, July, 1978.

Ehman, Lee. "Political Socialization and the High School Social Studies Curriculum." Unpublished dissertation. The University of Michigan, 1970.

Forehand, Garlie A.; Ragosta, Marjorie, and Rack, Donald A. Conditions and Processes of Effective School Desegregation, Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, July, 1976.

Glasser, William. Schools Without Failure.

Heid, Camilla. Part III of "A Study of the Causes of Disproportionality in Suspensions and Expulsions of Male and Black Students: Teacher and Administrator Attitudes." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association in Los Angeles, April, 1981.

Moody, Charles D., and others. Student Rights and Discipline: Policies, Programs and Procedures. ERIC ED 160 926, 1978.

Weinberg, Meyer. "Research Review of Equal Education," No. 1, ED 148 974, 1977.